



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,753	12/17/2001	Jidong Xu	13831.00008	2827

27160 7590 05/08/2003

PATENT ADMINSTRATOR  
KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN  
525 WEST MONROE STREET  
SUITE 1600  
CHICAGO, IL 60661-3693

EXAMINER

VY, HUNG T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2828

DATE MAILED: 05/08/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/015,753

Applicant(s)

XU ET AL.

Examiner

Hung T Vy

Art Unit

2828

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.


- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

  
PAUL IP  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. In response to the communications dated 12/17/2001, claims 1-10 are pending in this application.

### **Specification**

2. The specification has been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of possible minor errors. However, the applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112**

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 10, the phrase "the step of modulating" renders the claim indefinite because the claim does not provide any method for reducing stimulated Brillouin scattering. The claim only provides only single step of modulating.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102**

Art Unit: 2828

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 102 in view of the AIPA and H.R. 2215 that forms the basis for the rejections under this section made in the attached Office action:

**A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -**

**(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.**

35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as revised by the AIPA and H.R. 2215, applies to all qualifying references, except when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. For such patents, the prior art date is determined under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as it existed prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)).

Claims 1-2 and 10 are rejected under 35 U. S. C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by Waarts et al., U.S. patent No. 6,298,187.

Regarding claims 1-2, Waarts et al. disclose a multi -wavelength laser source (MWLS) system, comprising: first and second lasers (12) having first ( $f_1$ ) and second ( $f_2$ ) lasing frequencies (Fig 1), respectively; means for amplifying combined signals of said first and second lasers (14a)(See column 12, line 8-25), means for multiplying the amplified combined signals to yield comblike multi-channel WDM (18) laser signals separated from each other by a frequency equal to the difference between  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  (See column 12, line 8-25).

With respect to claim 10, the methods of reducing stimulated Brillouin scattering (SBS) are considered as product by process steps.

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Waarts et al., U.S. patent No. 6,298,187 in view of Veselka et al, U.S. patent No. 5,963,567.

Regarding claims 3-6, Waarts et al. discloses all limitation of claim except predetermined propagation characteristics being propagation mode, dispersion and length. However, Veselka et al. discloses predetermined propagation characteristics being propagation mode, dispersion and length (See column 1, line 50-62).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify Waarts et al. to have propagation mode, dispersion and length as taught by Veselka et al. because those skilled in the art will recognize that such modification and variations can be made without departing from the spirit of the invention.

Regarding claim 7-9, Waarts et al. discloses the claimed invention except for length of fiber, dispersion value and frequency of  $f_1$  and  $f_2$ . It would have been obvious

Art Unit: 2828

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to the same value of length, dispersion value and frequency, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or working ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

### **Citation of Pertinent References**

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The patent to Grubb et al. discloses Semiconductor Laser High Power Amplifier System For Materials Processing, U.S. Patent No. 6,433,306.

The patent application Publication to Matsushita et al. discloses Optical signal Amplifier, U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0176153.

The patent application publication to Kang discloses Compact, Highly Efficient and Rugged UV Source Based On Fiber Laser, U.S. Patent No. 2002/0054613.

The patent to Mizrahi et al. discloses WDM Optical Communication Systems with Wavelength-stabilized Optical Selectors, U.S. Patent No. 6,341,025.

### **Conclusion**

Art Unit: 2828

7. When responding to the office action, Applicants are advised to provide the examiner with the line numbers and page numbers in the application and/or references cited to assist the examiner to locate the appropriate paragraphs.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hung Vy whose telephone number is (703) 605-0759. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30 am - 5:30pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul IP can be reached on (703) 308-3098. The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



PAUL IP  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Hung T. Vy  
Art Unit 2828

May 2, 2003